

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 9 and 11 to 20 continue to be in the case.

*The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102.*

1.

Claims 1-2 and 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scecina (US pat 5511223).

With respect to claim 1 and 13, Scecina discloses an apparatus comprising:

1) A modular fieldbus board (Fig 1) comprising a number of fieldbuses (Fig 1 item 40 is the module, Fig 5 item 18 shows the fieldbus board itself) connected to a bulk power supply (column 3 lines 64-67).

2) A diagnostic system (Fig 1 item 50 and Fig 4) comprising a monitoring transceiver means connected to one or more of the number of fieldbuses (Fig 4 items 12-15) by means of two or more common mode and/or differential mode signal injection and/or signal detection points, which points are dispersed between the bulk power supply and the fieldbus trunk, such that the monitoring transceiver means can detect one or more fieldbus physical layer characteristics between two of the two or more of said points (Figs 4 and 5).

It is observed that the Office Action is not consistent in what are to be fieldbuses in the reference Scecina et al.

In the first paragraph relating to fieldbuses in the Office Action, the Scecina et al. reference refers to the module 40 of Figure 1 as a digital module for a control or protection system..

In the second paragraph the elements 12 to 15 of Figure 4 are fieldbuses.

It appears to be contradictory when the Office Action designates both the module 40 as a fieldbus as well as the elements 12, 13, 14, and 15 contained in module 40 according to Figure 4. also as fieldbuses. The reference Scecina et al. designates element 12 as a test signal generating device (column 5, line 67), element 13 as a test control device (column 5, line 65), element 14 as a data bus (column 5, line 66), and element 15 as a test response monitoring device (column 6, lines 10 and 11).

Where one element X contains several other elements X and this is repeated, a perpetuum mobile situation appears to be close, but the alleged anticipation is remote, since the fieldbuses of the claims 1 and 13 do not contain several other fieldbuses.

Applicants also note that the transceiver means of the Scecina et al. reference does not carry a reference character in the drawing of the reference Scecina et al. Also the Office Action refers to a bulk power supply in connection with the reference Scecina et al, but fails to assign a reference character to the alleged bulk power supply of Scecina et al. reference.

Applicants urge that the rejection of claims 1 and 13 over the Scecina et al. reference is too contradictory and should be withdrawn.


Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to overcome the rejections.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gunther Rogoll et all.

By:   
Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,  
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059  
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977  
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: MSA265

Rep/am